

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,937	09/26/2003	Timothy B. Stockwell	ABIOS.042A	9457
	7590 04/23/200 I, PATENT DEPT.	EXAMINER		
APPLIED BIO	SYSTEMS	ZHOU, SHUBO		
FOSTER CITY	CENTRE DRIVE , CA 94404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/672,937	STOCKWELL ET AL.					
	Examiner	Art Unit					
	SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU	1631					

	SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU	1631						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 23 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
In Ref. I FileD 3 was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as fling a Notice of Appeal. To a void abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort in (a) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the malling date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any sermed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp								
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filled, any reply must be filled within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS	aniir are arrie period secretariir 57	51 TC 4 1.57 (a).						
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> </ul> </li> </ol>								
(b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better		luoina or simplifuina ti	on incurse for					
appeal; and/or	er form for appear by materially rec	ideling of simplifying ti	ie issues ioi					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	u o o o uno de adaleste e estalese o o		DTOL 004)					
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (i	PTOL-324).					
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ol>								
non-allowable claim(s). would be all	owabie ir submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the					
7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov	ided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 1-9.11.16.18.45 and 46.								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. 🗌 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but see continuation sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Dote the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  13. Dother:								
	/SHUBO (Joe) ZHOU/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1631						

Continuation of 3(b): With regard to the new limitation "at least one of the generating and the identifying is performed by the computer," applicant did not point out, and the Office was unable to find adequate support therefor in the instant disclosure. While the instant specification describes using a general purpose computer to perform the steps of (i) acquiring sequence information retaining to at least one sample and to at least one reference for purposes of comparison; (ii) evaluating the sequence information retaining to the at least one sample to identify ambiguous bases present within the sample on the basis of the following criteria: (a) scan position differences, (b) peak height ratios, (c) peak are are talks, and (d) he so composition, and (iii) evaluating the quality and coverage of the sample sequence information in comparison to the reference sequence information to identify reportable ranges and sequence variants for the sample sequence information (see paragraph (0016) of the published application 2004/0142347), there is no adequate corpition that at least one of generating rule-based criteria ... and identifying ambiguous bases present within the consensus sequence information by comparing ...is performed by a computer.

Continuation of 11: Applicant's proposed amendment would've overcome the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 101 if entered. However, the amendment has not been entered for reasons set forth above. Hence, the claims are under rejection for the same reasons set forth in the final rejection.